REMARKS

The aforementioned Office Action rejected claims 1-8 as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the disclosed prior art in the instant specification in view of Yamaguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,636,186. This rejection is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that the disclosed prior art in the specification and Yamaguchi would not teach a person of ordinary skill in the art how to make an electrophoretic medium in accordance with any of the present claims.

The prior art discussed in the specification gives examples of the preparation of encapsulated and polymer-dispersed electrophoretic media using liquid suspending fluids. The encapsulated media are produced by first suspending particles in the (non-aqueous) liquid to form an internal phase, and then emulsifying the non-aqueous liquid in an aqueous medium containing a capsule-wall forming material, thereby forming a capsule around the individual droplets. The capsules thus formed are separated from the aqueous phase to provide the electrophoretic medium. (See, for example, the worked Example of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,185.) The polymer-dispersed media are produced in a similar manner by emulsifying the internal phase in a liquid form of a polymeric material which eventually forms the continuous phase of the polymer-dispersed medium (see the worked Examples of U.S. Patent No. 6,866,760). In both cases, these processes rely upon the ability of the liquid suspending medium to keep the particles in suspension for a period sufficient for the formation of the capsule wall or the curing of the liquid form of the polymeric material, without the particles being trapped in the capsule wall or the continuous phase. It is not possible to suspend particles in a gaseous suspending fluid in this manner. Hence, the prior art processes do not teach how to produce encapsulated or polymer-dispersed gas-based displays and the present claims are not obvious over the admitted prior art in view of Yamaguchi.

Incidentally, Yamaguchi evidently did consider it desirable in some cases to constrain the movement of his electrophoretic particles, but chose for this purpose to use a microcell display; see, for example, Figure 10 of Yamaguchi. However, Yamaguchi

does not suggest substituting a microcapsule or polymer-dispersed medium for this microcell medium. This is further evidence that such microcapsule and polymer-dispersed media were not obvious to one skilled in the art.

For the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of the present claims is unjustified.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in this application is respectfully requested.

Since the period prescribed for responding to the Office Action expired August 1, a Petition for a one month extension of this period is filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted

/David J. Cole/

David J. Cole
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation
733 Concord Avenue
Cambridge MA 02138-1002

Telephone (617) 499-6069
Fax (617) 499-6200
E-mail dcole@eink.com